REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 1-6.

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Reed et al. '658. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Reed does not disclose (or suggest) a (1 - D) convolution operation in the main path of the demodulating circuit, as in rejected independent claims 7, 9 and 11.

The Filter 152 of (1 - D) in Reed is not present in the main paths of the demodulating circuit, but is present in the REMOD 138, as part of the error pattern detecting circuit. The main paths of the demodulating circuit of Reed include the trellis SEQ detector 112, the syndrome generator 110 and error corrector 124.

In contrast, (1 - D) in claims 7, 9 and 11 are within the main paths of the demodulating circuit.

Furthermore, the sample 78 of input shown in Fig. 6 of Reed is PR4, for which convolution of (1 - D) (1 + D) has already been accomplished.

While the operation of the partial erasure 156 in the REMOD 138 is performed in the error pattern detecting circuit, convolution of (1 - D) and (1 + D) by filters 152 and 158 is performed by assuming the exclusion of the partial erasure results in, as a whole:

$$(1 - D) \cdot (1 + D) \cdot (1 + D)^2$$

This corresponds to k=s=1, in claims 7, 9 and 11. As seen above, n = 2 in Reed. Thus, Reed does not anticipate claims 7, 9 and 11 because n is a positive integer other than 2 in claims 7, 9 and 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By _____
Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

December 27, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978